

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 16, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1, 8, 15, 16 and 22 have been amended herein. As a result, claims 1-25 remain pending for examination with claims 1, 8, 16, and 22 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 6, 10, 15, 18 and 19.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17 and 20-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being purportedly anticipated by Ojha et al. (Reduced Size RF Coupler Design for Specialized Load Requirements). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

1. Discussion of Ojha et al.

FIG. 2 of Ojha et al. illustrates an RF coupler having one capacitor coupled to two ends (ports 2 and 3, top of FIG. 2) of a first conductive line and another capacitor coupled to two ends (port 1 and ground, bottom of FIG. 2) of a second conductive line. The bottom conductive line of Ojha has only two ports: Input Port 1 and a grounded port. As indicated at page 2 of the Office Action, it appears that the input signal provided at Port 1 of Ojha's coupler flows to the grounded port through the bottom conductive line.

2. The Claims Distinguish Over Ojha et al.

By contrast, claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, A directional distributed coupler comprising: a first conductive line carrying a main signal to be transmitted by an antenna, the main signal being carried between two end terminals of the first conductive line. Ojha does not teach or suggest a first conductive line carrying a main signal to be transmitted by an antenna, as Ojha makes no mention of an antenna. Quite to the contrary, the input signal provided at Port 1 of Ojha flows directly to ground (FIG 2). For these reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ojha et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable over Ojha et al. for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 as amended recites, *inter alia*, A distributed coupler, comprising: a first conductive line that carries a signal between a first terminal and a second terminal of the first conductive line to deliver the signal to an antenna. As should be appreciated from the above discussion with respect to claim 1, Ojha does not teach or suggest delivering a signal to an antenna. Therefore, claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Ojha et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-15 and 20 depend from claim 8 and are therefore patentable over Ojha et al. for at least the same reasons.

Claim 16 as amended recites, *inter alia*, A distributed coupler, comprising: a first conductive line that carries a signal between a first terminal and a second terminal of the first conductive line to deliver the signal to an antenna. As should be appreciated from the above discussion with respect to claim 1, Ojha does not teach or suggest delivering a signal to an antenna. Therefore, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Ojha et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 17-19 and 21 depend from claim 16 and are therefore patentable over Ojha et al. for at least the same reasons.

Claim 22 as amended recites, *inter alia*, A distributed coupler, comprising: a first conductive line that carries a signal between two terminals of the first conductive line to deliver the signal to an antenna. As should be appreciated from the above discussion with respect to claim 1, Ojha does not teach or suggest delivering a signal to an antenna. Therefore, claim 22 patentably distinguishes over Ojha et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are therefore patentable over Ojha et al. for at least the same reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: July 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James H. Morris  
Registration No.: 34,681  
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
Federal Reserve Plaza  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
(617) 646-8000